

Printed: 04-20-97
By: Howe, Carol
Priority: Normal
Topic: Re: CalFed Actions RFP (fwd)
Sent: 04-18-97
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.gov
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

Overall CALFED
- on mont / RPT
- outside issue
of the
program

Mail*Link»

Re: CalFed Actions RFP (fwd)

>Date: Thu, 17 Apr 1997 12:34:51 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>
>Subject: Re: CalFed Actions RFP (fwd)
>To: Cdarling@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov

>
>Cindy, Rick FYI chris

>
>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Tue, 15 Apr 1997 13:37:25 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Larry R Brown <lrbrown@s101dcascr.wr.usgs.gov>
>To: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>
>Cc: "Larry R Brown, Research Physical Scientist, Sacramento, CA "
> <lrbrown@s101dcascr.wr.usgs.gov>
>Subject: Re: CalFed Actions RFP

>
>Chris and others,

>I have read with interest, the responses of Sam Luoma, Bob Spies, and Vic
>DeVlaming, to Chris's e-mail. I have basically agreed with everything
>that has been said. My greatest fear in the CalFed process is that
>millions of dollars will be spent, victory will be declared, and none or
>few of the problems will actually be solved. I found Bob's suggestion
>for establishment of an independent group especially interesting.
>Concentrating on studies of process and long-term monitoring of
>conditions to assess any "fixes" attempted seems like a more fruitful
>course than rapidly spending a ton of money on things that people think
>might work (I HOPE I am being unfair to the process here).

>Another major concern is making sure that some form of integration occurs
>between these four groups. Shouldn't one of the criteria for assessment
>of a proposal be that it focuses on a geographic area that is considered
>important by the habitat group etc.? As Vic suggests, the lack of
>linkage between groups is disturbing. This somewhat reminds me of my
>feeling several years ago that folks working in the Delta generally
>seemed to think of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers as "inputs" that
>came into existence at Vernalis and Freepoint.

>
>Chris, see below for some additional comments.

>
>Larry

>
>>>>> Chris Foe writes:

>>
>PWT, I got this e-mail from Cindy Darling yesterday and need your help.
>Some background. CALFED is composed of 4 groups including an Ecosystem

>> Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Group. A number of you
>> participated in the water quality scoping efforts to develop a list of
>> constituents of concern that exceed Basin Plan water quality objectives
or

>> other criteria and actions to reduce or eliminate the exceedances.

Little

>> discussion occurred at the scoping meetings on the ecological
significance

>> of the exceedances. Conversely, the Ecosystem Restoration Group divided
>> the Central Valley and Delta into habitats and key species and are
>> recommending a series of actions to attempt to restore them.

>> Unfortunately, the Ecosystem Restoration Group did not consider
>> contaminants. One of Cindy's jobs is to develop the RFP for spending
>> early implementation funds. She has asked the PWT to review the

Ecosystem

>> Water Quality groups recommended priority actions and suggested criteria
>> for evaluating the proposals to ensure they are complete. CALFED hopes
to

>> release the RFP in early May. Hence, our comments are only of value if
>> we get them to Cindy pronto.

>>

>> I think the best way we can help CALFED is to try and collate our
>> recommendations into a few succinct comments, assuming we have any. Maybe
>> the best way is for each of us to review the actions and criteria and
>> e-mail me and the rest of the group with your thoughts. I will try and
>> collate these and send on to Cindy next thursday AM (17 April). I will
also

>> collect all the original comments and append them onto the back of the
>> document. What do you think? Does this make sense? Chris.

>> ----- Forwarded message -----

>> Date: Wed, 9 Apr 97 18:40:54 EDT

>> From:cdarling@goldeneye.water.ca.gov

>> To: chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov

>> Subject: RE: <NO SUBJECT>

>>

>> Thank you for helping solicit input from the IEP
>> Contaminants Effects Work Team. The questions I
>> would appreciate input on are:

>>

>> Are there other additional actions that they would
>> recommend be taken to address the impacts of water
>> quality on the ecosystem of the Delta and its
>> tributaries?

>>

>> Are there other water quality specific criteria that
>> we could use to evaluate the technical merit of
>> proposals received?

>>

>> As far as responses, they can be either transmitted
>> through you, e-mailed directly to me, or faxed to me
>> at 916-654-9780. Input by April 18 would be most
>> desirable but input by the end of the month would be
>> usefull.

>> As background, we will be requesting grant

>> applications to address these needs as well as others
>> in mid-May. The projects and programs will be
>> evaluated using the technical criteria along with
>> other criteria and a decision will be made in August
>> regarding what should be funded. If people are
>> interested in receiveing applications, they should
>> send a brief letter to CALFED at 1416 Ninth Street,
>> Suite 1155, Sacramento, CA 95814 requesting that they
>> be put on the mailing list.

>>
>> Thanks for your help.

>>
>> Here are the subject areas where the water quality
>> technical team thought projects should be solicited
>> as well as the technical criteria to evaluate water
>> quality projects:

>>
>>
>> Priority Water Quality Subject Areas

>>
>> 1. Establishment of a Comprehensive Water Quality
>> Monitoring and Assessment Program to identify water
>> quality problems, including unknown toxicity in
>> identified impaired water bodies in the Delta and its
>> tributary watersheds, and to assess the effectiveness
>> of corrective measures instituted through the CALFED
>> process. Proposals may be accepted for
>> implementation of portions of the program, where a
>> specific plan is presented for integrating the
>> activity into the overall program. The Comprehensive
>> Assessment Program may include, but not be limited to
>> the following elements: Standardized Quality
>> Assurance/Quality Control plans and protocols,
>> statistical sampling design, discrete and
>> continuous water quality monitoring, data evaluation
>> and interpretation, comprehensive, watershed-wide
>> water quality evaluations, data management, and
>> access to computerized data from multiple sources.

>
>This seems like an overwhelming project to all be accomplished by one
>entity; hence, the need for integration is essential. Without
>integration, CALFED will be left with a bunch of independent studies that
>may or may not fit together. In many cases it may not make sense to fund
>one piece of puzzle without at least having someone else doing the other
>piece. For example, studying off field transport of a pesticide might
>not be very informative without companion bioassays and TIEs. Is there a
>body of people who will be monitoring these studies and making sure
>integration occurs?

>
>>
>> 2. Reduction of the pesticides Chlorpyrifos,
>> Carbofuran, and Diazinon in the Sacramento and
>> San Joaquin Rivers and Delta from surface
>> agricultural drainage and Delta island drainage.

>> 3. Reduction of Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos,
>> nutrients, salinity , dissolved oxygen, turbidity
>> and metals in urban storm water runoff.

>> 4. Reduction of copper, zinc, and cadmium in the
>> Sacramento River above Hamilton City from abandoned
>> and inactive mines.

>> 5. Reduction of selenium in the San Joaquin River
>> and Delta from subsurface agricultural drainage in
>> the Grasslands area.

>> 6. Coordination of watershed water quality
>> activities related to toxic contaminant reduction
>> and development of watershed-wide solutions to water
>> quality problems affecting the
>> ecosystem.

>See comment on #1.

>> 7. Reduction of mercury in identified impaired
>> water bodies, as defined through the CALFED Water
>> Quality Program, from abandoned and inactive mines
>> and gold mining activities.

>> Water Quality Specific Selection Criteria

>> 1. Water quality projects will be evaluated based on
>> the quantity of water quality benefit that would be
>> achieved in the Delta or in areas related to species
>> dependant on the Delta.

>> 2. Projects having regional, as opposed to local,
>> water quality benefits will be preferred.

>> 3. Projects that develop sustained water quality
>> benefits, rather than temporary one time fixes will
>> be preferred.

>> 4. The capacity of the project to achieve water
>> quality targets must be demonstrated.

=====